

Executive summary:

The User Group Board of Directors met at the end of the User Group Meeting, 20 June 2007. The major topics for discussion included a variety of expected issues for the coming year with the lab director, a review of the user group meeting, and assignments for areas of responsibility for the board members.

Jefferson Lab User Group Board of Directors Minutes to Meeting of 20 June 2007

Review of User Group Meeting

There was good attendance at the meeting this year, in part due to its scheduling adjacent to the Halls A and B collaboration meetings. The long-range plan (LRP) talks Monday were particularly well received. The board thanks Rachel Harris and staff services for their work on the User Group Meeting.

Several ideas were proposed to improve the meeting next year.

- We should email out the student winners of the thesis prize and the poster competition in time with the meeting, plus the new UGBoD members. We should do it this year as soon as possible.
- The students much appreciated the pizza lunch. The board thanks Bob Welsh for his help with this. While some were happy with pizza every day, others would like greater variety. Alternate suggestions included sandwiches and sushi.
- There is the possibility that we could attract more students to the meeting if we have better overlap with HUGS. We could either follow HUGS, or we could try to arrange a break in the middle. This potentially increases graduate student attendance by about 20 people.
- There was a strong feeling that, while many speakers are quite informative, the talks are usually at levels beyond that needed for the young students. There is discussion during the board meeting about possibly arranging question & answer sessions during lunch, having sessions oriented towards the students, or perhaps having a half-day pre-meeting to provide some basic introductions to the students.
- The all-plenary session format was preferred, along with the generally longer talks (30 minutes), even though this limits the number of speakers that we can have.
- Judging the posters during the session before the reception was considered a clear improvement, allowing the judges to easily see the posters and interact with the students, although it kept people out of the sessions. However, the judges in rating the posters had a large emphasis on the presentation by the students, not just on the posters, and it was felt that the students got better at explaining the posters as time went on. For next year, we plan to continue to have the poster session during the reception, but to have the judging done with the students the following morning. There were some questions about the judging of the poster session, and whether more emphasis should be placed on the posters as opposed to the presentation. Aidan Kelleher will draft a proposed standard to be reviewed by the board.
- The User Forum worked okay this year, after starting slowly. For next year, we should try to solicit issues in advance, and engage users and board members to bring up questions for discussion.

Discussion with Christoph Leemann on issues for the coming year

Money is the lifeline for the lab, and we can be cautiously optimistic for 2008. The Senate markup is in progress, hopefully at the requested level. Earmarks are a possible issue. Desperation and elation are close together – think of how the relatively small differences in the three funding scenarios for the long range plan / out year projections make such a difference. We can still hope for the planned doubling of

the Office of Science budget, but we need to make plans for less.

The 12 GeV construction will not start as quickly as we had hoped; it could be ready in FY2009. We will need to do more than we would like with contract labor. A core problem is that the 12 GeV staff needs go up and down, because a lot of work (engineering / design) needs to be done before the next stage (construction) starts.

The 12 GeV project has now moved to #1 in the LRP. The project completion, CD4, will come in 2015, 20 years after we started talking about the upgrade. It seems like this 20 year time scale is roughly constant for big nuclear physics projects. New requirements from DOE add more contingency in time into the schedule. Using money efficiently and obtaining outside money might allow us to accelerate schedule.

The 4 NSAC paragraph talks at the UserGroup Meeting were much appreciated. The theme worked. The connections that have developed with the nuclear structure community were very helpful for the long range plan.

How can we influence the budget during the out years? It is better if we can influence the budget process at the beginning, impressing DOE with our excitement about our science, by providing simple messages, instead of having to try to do corrective actions with Congress towards the end of the process.

NSF and DOE both have people come and work for a year. Three people from the laboratory have worked temporarily at DOE in the past. Blaine Norum of Uva was at NSF this past year. We should encourage people to consider going to DOE/NSF for a year. DOE basically pays people at their current salary level, so it could be done as an unpaid leave, as opposed to as a sabbatical.

The director search was discussed. The board has been very pleased with the efforts of the committee to get input from the user community.

Christoph's point to us about the differing time scales of the lab and users is well stated and appreciated by us. The natural long term time scale for the users is about 3 years, the length of a grant cycle, whereas labs more naturally have several year time scales, the time between upgrades. Ray Orbach at DOE has an even longer time scale; he recently indicated interest in what the lab would do after 12 GeV. It is clear that, even with 12 GeV only about to start construction, we need to keep active in possible future machines like EIC.

We are now at the point in the 12 GeV upgrade process at which we need stronger user commitments. We need to be concerned about scheduling what runs before 12 GeV, given the estimate that we will lose about 20% of the physics possible with optimal accelerator operations. Ed notes that it is obvious that we have to lose some of the program, but we need to keep pushing on this, so it does not get worse. We need to make sure DOE appreciates what good physics will be lost. Gail notes that we likely will lose some A rated experiments, even with 80% run.

Christoph requests proposals about how to improve process / communications; people with ideas should put them forth.

There is some concern with how experiments have run this spring; largely because of scheduling that requires lots of energy / pass changes in conjunction with new operators, efficiencies have been low, though the situation has been better the past few weeks. Various members, remembering how poorly

some earlier electron accelerators ran, are thankful that we run much better.

User Group Board Changes and Activities

With Rafaella, Gail, and Peter leaving, and Latifa, Wally, and Larry joining the board, we need to assign areas of responsibility.

Ed Brash will move to *computing*, as Peter is leaving. Wally Melnitchouk was elected to be the *experiment/theory liaison* person. Todd Averett will move to *running experiments*, so Latifa can become the *quality of life* person. Particular interests here include the status of F wing, ongoing visa issues, the topic of women in science, an issue that has been raised this past year, though we have had no chance to work on it. An upcoming issue is a move in Congress to limit the number of H1B visa available for universities; this is also an issue for NUFO. This leaves the *PAC* position for Larry Weinstein.

Ed will look into computing / connectivity problems at Resfac. Rafaella noticed a problem with phones back when the transition occurred.

The CUGA and graduate student mailing lists have been a problem. These lists only include perhaps half of the people who should be on them. The board asks the laboratory to develop a mechanism to automatically add people to the lists (user / postdoc / graduate student) as they register as users at the laboratory; people should be able to opt out of the lists if they do not want to be on them. (Note: Rachel Harris has met with computing people; a mechanism has been set up.)

The User Group Board has recently started a series of informal 1-2 hour monthly meetings, since our three yearly meetings and emails were proving insufficient for the issues we have to deal with. These meetings were helpful in the past few months, and we should continue this. There is a feeling that we should reconsider what we have during our 3 day long meetings each year. We should focus more on issues than on status reports.

Last year the board successfully nominated three people for DNP offices; two were elected. This year we are trying to nominate two people, Curtis Meyer of Carnegie-Mellon and Joerg Reinhold of Florida International, to the DNP Executive Committee. While the JLab community is the largest nuclear user community in the world, and represents about 1/3 of DNP, we have been under-represented in DNP in the past. We need to stay aware of DNP officers and try to nominate people to keep proportional representation. We should try to avoid over-nominating people, being nasty or overbearing. As two people in the chairline are connected to our community, we will not nominate anyone as chair this year.

Issues and activities related to JSA

Jerry Draayer has warned us of an increase in the Resfac price. While the Resfac is still a bargain compared to other local facilities, and is operated at cost, it is not as much of a bargain as in the past. The board agrees that we need to review this issue during our next meeting.

Jerry Draayer announced a new position, a science coordinator. The person is expected to be paid by SURA, and to work as a reviewer on the JSA Initiatives, on political issues, etc. SURA is interested in having a person with a scientific background, but strong political / public policy interests, as a representative.

New faculty have been important to the mission of the laboratory. Faculty growth comes first from the original SURA proposal to DOE for new lab related positions, and second from bridge/joint positions, funded from the lab. There are about equal numbers of the two types of positions. The UGBoD would

like to see additional efforts to create more positions.

The JSA Initiatives Fund

The Board discusses the JSA Initiatives fund. This fund follows previous SURA support to the program, intended to support activities that cannot be funded under the contract. Under SURA, the fund supported several programs, including a lab director discretionary fund, sabbatical support up to \$1500/ month – housing for non-local SURA faculty, part of the Isgur fellowship, and graduate student fellowships. The Initiatives Fund will have \$375,000 annually after the director's discretionary fund; it is expected that proposals to use this money will come from the lab, through Tony Thomas, and from the User Group. Assuming the projects supported by the previous SURA fund continue to be supported, and the previous SURA fund was fully utilized, there is a modest amount of new money for some new initiatives.

Since SURA management has now become JSA management, it is appropriate to consider if the support of sabbaticals and graduate students should be broadened beyond SURA people, to the full Jefferson Lab community. Also, with the new demands of the 12 GeV project, it would be desirable to create additional bridge faculty. The Initiatives fund is not sufficient by itself to support new faculty positions, but perhaps some fraction of the new money can be leveraged to create some new bridge positions each year.

The User Group Board has already made several requests of the Initiatives Fund, which were largely funded thanks to Ed Brash's persuasive support at the recent Committee meeting in Miami. The Board thanks the JSA Initiatives Fund for support of the User Group Meeting, the thesis prize, and the poster session prizes. The support of the User Group Meeting in particular enabled us to provide free registrations for the graduate students, pizza lunches for the students, and some support for the speakers.

In addition, the Initiatives Fund provided support for three new projects. Aidan Kelleher is making arrangements with JLab Public Affairs to start a graduate student tour guide program; the lab has been generally supportive of this, although some kinks remain to be ironed out. The Initiatives Fund has also agreed to sponsor a new JSA Postdoc Prize. The User Group Board will run this competition. Details will soon be sent to the user community. The third project sponsored is a “Capitol Hill” day trip to Washington. We need to coordinate this with SURA and the appropriate representatives and senators, particularly from Virginia. We can also learn from trips arranged by high energy physics, NUFO, and APS.

A project not funded was proposed by Gail Dodge. It requested funds to cover graduate student travel to conferences. The idea arose from problems the Hall B Collaboration has had; even when students have been accepted as conference speakers, it has often been a problem for them to get travel funding. A concern with JSA was how the fund would be administered. Apparently JSA would prefer the UGBoD to administer the fund. **Gail will rewrite the proposal to address the administration problems and submit it to the board.**

The board will be involved in soliciting and reviewing future proposals to the JSA Initiatives Fund. We should coordinate with the laboratory to not duplicate efforts. A concern with the proposals that we should consider is whether the board is getting involved in too many things, taking too much time.

Other items

This spring, due to difficulties associated with running numerous beam energies in the halls and changes in the schedule, there have been questions about the published schedule and the MCC whiteboard, which is posted on the web, frequently updated, not archived, and often includes detailed schedule adjustments reflecting compromises between the halls.

Computer accounts of people who have left the lab might need to be accessed for considerable time afterward for analysis projects, or if people return later to the lab. We should investigate whether there are issues here.

There are concerns that the spam filter is catching emails it should not. Is it possible to make certain that email from certain sites, such as aps.org, is not kept as spam?

There is concern that too much money is spent by the lab on printing and copying. The lab should attempt to reduce paper.

There is concern that the lab should start a professional effort towards publicly accessible long term archiving its results – cross sections, asymmetries, and other useful results, not simply publications.